

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

REMARKS

This is in full and timely response to the Office Action on the merits dated November 17, 2005. Reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing
5 amendments and the following remarks.

By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-12, 14-15, and 19-20 have been canceled and claim 13 has been amended. Therefore, claims 13 and 16-18 remain in this application with claim 13 being independent.

10 **IN THE CLAIMS:****35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103 Rejections:**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 4,343,379 to Haulotte. Further, claims 7-8, 10-15 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §
15 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipperfield (U.S. Pat. No. 5,855,359) in view of Haulotte and further in view of Coates (U.S. Pat. No. 4,558,847).. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipperfield in view of Haulotte and further in view of Watkins (U.S. Pat. No. 6,679,479). Still further, claim 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chipperfield in view of Haulotte and Coates and further in
20 view of Watkins.

Without admitting the propriety of these rejections, claims 1-12, 14-15 and 19-20 have been canceled and claim 13 has been amended. First, the examiner stated that Chipperfield

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

discloses a pair of rollers. The applicant urges that the examiner has not fully appreciated the rollers of the present invention and claim 13 has been amended to more perfectly recite the unique configuration utilized in the present invention. More particularly, claim 13 now recites that a pair of rollers are "rotatably mounted to respective second ends of said lifting arms for supporting said tire and wheel atop said rollers and allowing said tire and wheel to rotate thereon." This was originally recited in claim 15 and does not constitute newly claimed subject matter.

The applicant strongly urges that Chipperfield is improperly combined with the other references to support a rejection of the now revised claim 13. Chipperfield does not disclose a pair of rollers rotatably coupled at respective second ends of respective lifting arms for allowing a tire and wheel to rotate thereon. Chipperfield, by contrast, specifically discloses rollers 71a, b that are disposed within the hollow interior of the side rails 16, 17 for sliding movement therein. Further, the Chipperfield rollers are coupled to the horizontal shafts (axles) -- not to the lifting arms at all! Further, the rollers of Chesterfield do not provide or even purport to allow a tire and wheel to rotate thereon. By contrast, claim 13 recites a pair of rollers rotatably mounted to respective second ends of said lifting arms for supporting said tire and wheel atop said rollers and allowing said tire and wheel to rotate thereon. As clearly disclosed in the specification of the present application, rotation of the rollers allows the holes of the wheel to match the holes of the vehicles's hub (Application p. 5, lines 18-20). With Chesterfield providing absolutely no disclosure or suggestion of having rollers extending along ends of respective lifting arms to enable tire and wheel combinations to rotate smoothly thereon, the applicant urges that it would not have been obvious to combine Chipperfield with any other references whereby to reject

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 should now be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested along with claims 16-18 which depend therefrom.

Next, without admitting the propriety of the present rejections, claim 13 has been further amended to recite "a pair of ramp members mounted to respectived side members of said base, said pair of ramp members having a configuration for allowing a tire to be rolled smoothly between a ground surface and said second ends of said lifting arms." The applicant believes that the examiner has incorrectly read Chipperfield in that Chipperfield does not disclose the same structure or configuration as that recited in the present application. More particularly, Chipperfield discloses a downwardly extending ramp member attached to the upper wheel platform assembly 13. The present invention, by contrast includes a pair of ramp members attached to side members of the base 110. Having ramps on either side of the base is clearly advantageous over a single ramp attached to the platform. With the present configuration, the ramp is not left in the way during use, as in Chipperfield, and allows a tire to be rolled into position from either direction. Clearly, the Chipperfield reference does not teach the superior configuration recited in the present invention. For these additional reasons, claim 13 should be in condition for allowance and such is respectfully requested.


If the examiner has any suggestions that would place this application in even better condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Docket 61784
Serial No. 10/800,248

PATENT APPLICATION

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 24, 2006


Dale J. Ream
Patent Reg. No. 45,798

HARSHAW RESEARCH, INC.
Lawyer's Building
2nd & Main
P.O. Box 418
Telephone (785) 242-9500
Facsimile (785) 242-3308